

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/743,856	ESPINOZA ET AL.
	Examiner Jafar Parsa	Art Unit 1621

All Participants:

(1) Jafar Parsa.

Status of Application: pending

(3) _____

(2) Beatrice Ortego.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 28 November 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plecha et al (USPN 6,124,367) in view of Geerling et al (USPN 6,130,184).

Claims discussed:

1 and 17

Prior art documents discussed:

US 6,124,367

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner proposed to narrow the range of cobalt content in the catalyst by increasing the lower limit of the cobalt from 40% to 48.8%. US patent 6,124,367 the working examples are limited to 12 wt. % cobalt in the catalyst. Furthermore, the Examiner inadvertently rejected claims 1-67 over Plecha et al in view of Geerling et al. The actual claims that were rejected are: claims 1-6, 17 and 43-60 and 67, which are directed to the subject matter of Group III.